

equipment for all? Why determine the extent of education in anatomy for a graduate of a medical school and fail to determine the same thing in the case of an osteopath who claims to have an equal and similar fundamental education? Let us read what *The Osteopath*, a journal of that sect published in Los Angeles, has to say on the subject in its issue for November-December, 1906:

"The applicant for a State certificate of qualifications to practice medicine in the State of California must take an examination in the following subjects: Anatomy, physiology, bacteriology, pathology, chemistry and toxicology, surgery, obstetrics, materia medica and therapeutics, theory and practice of medicine. The applicant for a certificate of qualification to practice osteopathy should properly be examined in all of the foregoing subjects except materia medica and theory and practice of medicine; in lieu of these, he should be examined in gynecology, physical diagnosis, and principles and practice of osteopathy. The present medical board is composed of regulars, homeopaths and eclectics. The applicant for a State certificate is examined by the mixed board on all subjects except materia medica and principles and practice of medicine. On these subjects he is examined by the representative of his particular system. In other words, in the branches of science common to all, one examination is conducted; in the special materia medica and theory and practice of it, the regular is examined by regulars, the homeopath by homeopaths and the eclectic by eclectics."

Now, let us consider the claims put forth by the osteopathic colleges as to the fundamental instruction given. Fortunately, the *Texas State Journal of Medicine* has compiled a list of the text books recommended by a number of schools, including regular, homeopath, eclectic and the American School of Osteopathy at Kirksville, Mo. In the list of text books recommended by the last mentioned institution, we find a total of 118 titles; of these 112 are written by members of the regular profession, and but six are by osteopathic authors. In the subject of "Practice," we find 38 titles listed, and of these but 4 authors are of the osteopathic school. Of the 34 books on practice written by regulars, we find such names of authors as Anders, Osler, Tyson, Eichhorst, Stelwagon, Hyde, Pusey, Dana, Barker, Fox, etc. Would it not appear from the text books used and the instruction alleged to be given, that the practice of osteopathy comes mighty near the practice of medicine? Then why have a separate and distinct board to license osteopaths? Why permit one board to license persons, without any demonstration of their fitness, to practice medicine under the name of osteopathy? Is the State safeguarding its people properly and fully if it says that any one to practice medicine as such must demonstrate his fitness, but that he may practice

medicine, under the cloak of osteopathy, without inquiring into his qualifications to do so? As we have already seen, in the paragraphs quoted from *The Osteopath*, even the members of that cult raise the question themselves. Granted that the given individual has had sufficient education in the fundamental branches of medical science (as taught in all medical schools, and which the osteopaths say they teach in their colleges), to pass an examination at the hands of a composite board, do you think he can do much harm, whether he gives big pills, or little pills, or no pills, or massages the spine? He certainly must have enough knowledge of anatomy and physiology and pathology to keep him from going farther astray than the average educated physician, and that is all that the State does or should require, and all that the courts hold should be demanded of him who treats the sick. Then, why not concentrate the police work of the State, so far as it deals with healing the sick, in the hands of one board? Do away with the examination in materia medica and therapeutics and principles and practice of medicine, and simply require every applicant of whatever school or pathy to take the same examination which the disciple of any other school is required to take. Is this not a rational and practical solution of the problem?

The State journal that does not give its active as well as its passive support to the work of the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry of the American Medical Association, is by implication making its State medical organization a traitor to the American Medical Association and a deserter from the camp of its friends. It was the House of Delegates of the A. M. A. that established and made permanent the Council. It was done with the overwhelming approval of the delegates representing the State organizations, and those organizations must either support the work or repudiate it. For two consecutive years they have supported it in the House of Delegates of the A. M. A., and now they must either support it in their own home States or stand charged with hypocrisy and double dealing. If a publication, owned and controlled by a medical society which has gone on record as supporting the Council, persists in advertising the rank and worthless frauds which have been exposed by the Council, how can we reproach the published-for-profit journals, or even the *Medical Record* or the *New York Medical Journal*, for doing the same thing? And the work of the Council is all for the purpose of securing just one little thing—nothing more or less than simple truth and honesty on the part of the manufacturer who presents his wares for our consumption. Is that too much to ask? Just simple truth? Is there a medical society in the United States that would have the nerve to go on record as opposing the fight for truth and honesty? And yet a number of the organs of State medical organizations are tacitly opposing this work and this struggle for truth, by ignoring it. Last month the JOURNAL had a few words of criticism in regard to the policy